arXiv:1110.5880v1 [math.CO] 26 Oct 2011

DECOMPOSING INVERSION SETS OF PERMUTATIONS AND APPLICATIONS TO FACES OF THE LITTLEWOOD-RICHARDSON CONE

R. DEWJI, I. DIMITROV, A. MCCABE, M. ROTH, D. WEHLAU, AND J. WILSON

Abstract. If $\sigma \in S_n$ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, the inversion set of σ is $\Phi(\sigma) = \{(i, j) \,|\, 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\}$. We describe all r-tuples $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in S_n$ such that $\Delta_n^+ = \{(i, j) \,|\, 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ is the disjoint union of $\Phi(\sigma_1), \Phi(\sigma_2), \ldots, \Phi(\sigma_r)$. Using this description we prove that certain faces of the Littlewood-Richardson cone are simplicial and provide an algorithm for writing down their sets of generating rays. We also consider and solve the analogous problem for the Weyl groups of root systems of type B and C and provide some enumerative results.

Keywords: Inversion set, Simple permutation, Littlewood-Richardson cone, Catalan numbers.

1. Introduction

Let n be a positive integer and consider a root system Δ_n. Fix a set of positive roots Δ_n^+ so that $\Delta_n = \Delta_n^+ \sqcup \Delta_n^-$ where $\Delta_n^- = -\Delta_n^+$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ denote the corresponding Weyl group. For $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}$, the inversion set of σ, $\Phi(\sigma)$ is defined by $\Phi(\sigma) := \{v \in \Delta_n^+ \mid \sigma \cdot v \in \Delta_n^-\}$. We are concerned with ways to express the positive roots as a disjoint union of inversion sets: $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$ where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in \mathcal{W}$.

We consider here only root systems of type A, B or C. For simplicity we describe the problem and our results first for root systems of type A. The Weyl group of the root system A_n is $\mathcal{W} = S_{n+1}$ the symmetric group on $n+1$ letters. For ease of notation, we replace $n+1$ by n and work with A_{n-1} and S_n. Thus Δ_n refers to the rank $n-1$ root system of type A_{n-1}. Root systems of type B and C have isomorphic Weyl groups and so yield identical answers to our questions. We describe our results for type B/C root systems in §4–5.

For $\sigma \in S_n$ we write $\sigma = (\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \ldots, \sigma(n))$. Id_n denotes the identity permutation: $\mathrm{Id}_n = (1, 2, \ldots, n)$ and $w_o = w_o[n] = (n, n-1, \ldots, 1) \in S_n$. Often we will write w_o to denote $w_o[n]$ when the value of n is clear from the context. We use the symbol $\sqcup$ to denote a disjoint union.

Date: October 27, 2011.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E15; 05A05, 05E10, 52B20.

For the root system of type A_{n-1} we may take $\Delta_n^+ := \{(i,j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ for the positive roots. The element $(1,n)$ is the *highest root*. The elements $(i,i+1)$ with $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ are the *simple roots*.

Often we will use Δ^+ to denote Δ_n^+ when the value of n is clear from the context. Given $\sigma \in S_n$, the *inversion set of* σ is the set $\Phi(\sigma) := \{(i,j) \in \Delta_n^+ \mid \sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\}$. Note that $\Phi(\mathrm{Id}) = \emptyset$ and $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}[n]) = \Delta_n^+$.

It is not hard to see that the element $\sigma \in S_n$ is determined by its inversion set $\Phi(\sigma)$. Thus there are exactly $n!$ inversion sets contained in Δ_n^+.

Definition 1.1. A *decomposition* of an inversion set $\Phi(\sigma)$ is a set of disjoint inversion sets $\Phi(\sigma_1), \Phi(\sigma_2), \ldots, \Phi(\sigma_r)$ such that

$$\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)\ .$$

The decomposition is called *trivial* if $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_a)$ for some a with $1 \leq a \leq r$.

We say that an element $\sigma \in S_n$ (and its inversion set $\Phi(\sigma)$) is *reducible* if there exists a non-trivial decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$. Otherwise we say that σ (and $\Phi(\sigma)$) is *irreducible*. Note that $\Phi(\mathrm{Id}) = \emptyset$ may occur in a decomposition.

Solving the following problem was the motivation for this article.

Problem 1.2. Identify all decompositions of Δ_n^+:

$$\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)\ .$$

Here the ordering of the σ_i is not relevant.

We are interested in this problem because of its relation to two problems: (i) determining the regular codimension n faces of the Littlewood-Richardson cone; and (ii) studying the cup product of the cohomology of line bundles on homogeneous varieties. We briefly describe the relation to the Littlewood-Richardson cone in the next paragraph. More details and the relation of Problem 1.2 to the cup product of line bundles appear in §7.

If A is a Hermitian matrix, denote by $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ its eigenvalues and let $\mathbb{R}_+^{3n} = \{(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \,|\, \lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}, \mu_i \geq \mu_{i+1}, \nu_i \geq \nu_{i+1} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$. In 1912 H. Weyl posed the following question: For which triples $(\lambda,\mu,\nu) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{3n}$ do there exist Hermitian matrices A, B, C such that $C = A + B$ and whose eigenvalues are λ, μ, ν respectively. In 1962 A. Horn proved that the set of such triples is a polyhedral cone $\mathcal{C}'$ and conjectured inequalities determining $\mathcal{C}'$. Horn's conjecture was proved in the 1990's by Klyachko and Knutson and Tao, see [F] for a nice exposition on Horn's conjecture. It is worth mentioning that the lattice points of $\mathcal{C}'$ are exactly the triples (λ,μ,ν) for which the corresponding Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu}$ is nonzero. N. Ressayre described all *regular faces of* $\mathcal{C}'$, i.e. faces that intersect the interior of $\mathbb{R}_+^{3n}$. In particular (after symmetrizing the problem, as described in §7), the regular faces of codimension n are exactly the intersection of $\mathbb{R}_+^{3n}$ with the subspaces defined by

$$w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu = 0$$

for $w_1, w_2, w_3 \in S_n$ with the property that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3)$.

Definition 1.3. Let $\sigma \in S_n$. An *interval* (of size t) is a set of consecutive integers $\{i, i+1, i+2, \dots, i+t-1\}$. A *block* (of size t) of the permutation σ is an interval $\{i, i+1, i+2, \dots, i+t-1\}$ of size t such that the set $\{\sigma(i), \sigma(i+1), \dots, \sigma(i+t-1)\}$ is also an interval (of size t). Every permutation in S_n has n blocks of size 1 and a block of size n. If $\sigma \in S_n$ has no blocks of size t for all $1 < t < n$ then we say that σ is *simple*[1].

Example 1.4. The permutation $\sigma = (9, 7, 1, 5, 3, 4, 6, 8, 2) \in S_9$ has a block of size 8 corresponding to the interval $\{2, 3, \dots 9\}$ and a block size 4 corresponding to the interval $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. The permutation $\tau = (5, 2, 6, 1, 4, 7, 3) \in S_6$ has no non-trivial blocks and so is simple.

A block of size $t+1$ for the permutation σ corresponds to a $t \times t$ closed square in $[1, n] \times [1, n]$ which contains $t+1$ points of the the graph of σ. Hence σ is simple if there does not exist a $t \times t$ closed square in containing $t+1$ points of the graph of σ with $2 \leq t \leq n-1$.

To state our results we need to introduce an inflation procedure to describe permutations inductively. We describe this procedure heuristically as follows. We consider a permutation on n letters as a shuffling of a deck of n cards. We shuffle as follows. First cut the deck into m piles of sizes $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m$ respectively. Shuffle each of these piles according to a permutation $\sigma_a \in S_{z_a}$. Finally reassemble the piles in an order determined by a permutation $\sigma_0 \in S_m$. The resulting permutation in S_n is denoted by $\sigma_0[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m]$ and is called an inflation of σ_0.

Note that a permutation $\alpha \in S_n$ is simple if and only if α cannot be expressed as an inflation $\alpha = \sigma[\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_r]$ with $2 \leq r \leq n-1$.

Definition 1.5. A permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is called *plus-decomposable* if σ may be written in the form $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}_2[\alpha, \beta]$. Otherwise σ is *plus-indecomposable*. Similarly, $\sigma \in S_n$ is called *minus-decomposable* if σ may be written in the form $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}[2][\alpha, \beta]$. Otherwise σ is *minus-indecomposable*.

The following theorem of Albert, Atkinson and Klazar illustrates the importance of simple permutations and the inflation procedure.

Theorem 1.6 ([AAK][Theorem 1]). *Let $n \geq 2$. For every permutation $\alpha \in S_n$ there exists a simple permutation $\sigma \in S_m$ and permutations $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m$ such that $\alpha = \sigma[\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m]$. Moreover if $\sigma \neq \mathrm{Id}_2$ and $\sigma \neq w_{\mathrm{o}}[2]$ then $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m$ and σ are unique. If $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}_2$ then β_1, β_2 and σ are unique if we add the additional condition that β_1 is plus-indecomposable. Similarly, if $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}[2]$ then β_1, β_2 and σ are unique if we add the additional condition that β_1 is minus-indecomposable.* □

For our purposes, we modify the statement of the above theorem as follows.

---

[1] We warn the reader that some authors use the terminology *connected* rather than simple.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $n \geq 2$. For every permutation $\alpha \in S_n$ there exists a permutation $\sigma \in S_m$ and permutations $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m$ such that $\alpha = \sigma[\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m]$ where either σ is simple and $m \geq 4$ or $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}_m$ or $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]$. Furthermore this expression for α is unique if we require that m be maximal when $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}_m$ or $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]$, i.e., that each β_a is plus-indecomposable when $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}$ and each β_a is minus-indecomposable when $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}$.* $\square$

Definition 1.8. We say that α is expressed in *simple form* when we write $\alpha = \sigma[\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m]$ in the form guaranteed by Theorem 1.7, i.e, when σ is simple with $m \geq 4$ or $\sigma = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]$ or Id_m with m maximal.

We now state our main result.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_r)$ be a decomposition with all $\Phi(w_a) \neq \emptyset$. Then (after possibly reordering) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \sigma_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1m}] \\ w_2 &= \sigma_2[\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \ldots, \beta_{2m}] \\ &\vdots \\ w_r &= \sigma_r[\beta_{r1}, \beta_{r2}, \ldots, \beta_{rm}] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(\dagger) \quad \Phi(\beta_{1b}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{2b}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{rb}) = \Delta_{z_b}^+ \text{ is a decomposition} \qquad \forall b = 1, 2, \ldots, m$$

and $\sigma_q = \sigma_{q+1} = \cdots = \sigma_r = \mathrm{Id}_m$ with

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m] \text{ and } q{=}2, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \sigma_1 \text{ is simple, } \sigma_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1 \text{ and } q{=}3, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the above decomposition of Δ_n^+ is irreducible if and only if the decompositions $(\dagger)$ are irreducible for all b, exactly one of $\beta_{a1}, \beta_{a2}, \ldots, \beta_{am}$ is not equal to Id *for each $a = q, q+1, \ldots, r$, and*

$$\begin{cases} m = 2 \text{ and } \beta_{11} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_1} \text{ and } \beta_{12} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \beta_{1b} = \beta_{2b} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_b} \text{ for all } b = 1, 2, \ldots, m, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

Example 1.10. Let $n = 8$ and let $w_1 = (5, 3, 4, 8, 1, 2, 6, 7)$, $w_2 = (4, 5, 6, 1, 7, 8, 3, 2)$, $w_3 = (1, 3, 2, 4, 6, 5, 7, 8)$. Then $\Delta_8^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3)$, $m = 4$, and

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= (2,4,1,3)[(3,1,2),(1),(1,2),(1,2)] \\ w_2 &= (3,1,4,2)[(1,2,3),(1),(1,2),(2,1)] \\ w_3 &= (1,2,3,4)[(1,3,2),(1),(2,1),(1,2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Also $\beta_{11} = (21)[(1),(12)] = (2,3,1)$, $\beta_{21} = (12)[(1),(12)] = \mathrm{Id}_3$, $\beta_{31} = (12)[(1),(21)] = (1,3,2)$ and all other $\beta_{ij} = \mathrm{Id}$. Note that $\Delta_3^+ = \Phi(\beta_{11}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{21}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{31}) = \Phi(\beta_{11}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{31})$.

The recursive form of this theorem allows us to inductively solve many problems concerning decompositions. For example, in §6 we exploit this recursiveness to obtain a number of results enumerating various solutions to the main problem. In §7 we use the form to prove a result about the decompositions which yields an algorithm producing all generating rays on a given regular codimension n face of the Littlewood-Richardson cone.

2. Preliminaries

It is easy to see that an inversion set Φ must satisfy the following two conditions:

(i) If $(i,j),(j,k) \in \Phi$ then $(i,k) \in \Phi$. (*closed condition*)
(ii) If $(i,j),(j,k) \notin \Phi$ then $(i,k) \notin \Phi$. (*co-closed condition*)

In [K, Proposition 5.10] it is shown that any subset $\Phi \subseteq \Delta_n^+$ which satisfies the above two conditions is an inversion set. Thus $\Phi \subset \Delta_n^+$ is an inversion set if and only if both Φ and Φ^{c} satisfy the closed condition.

The graph of a permutation σ is the set of n lattice points $\{(i,\sigma(i)) \mid i = 1,2,\ldots,n\}$ considered as a subset of $[1,n]\times[1,n] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. There are $\binom{n}{2}$ line segments joining points of the graph of σ. Each such line segment corresponds to an element of Δ_n^+ and those with negative slope correspond to the elements $\Phi(\sigma)$, i.e., $(i,j) \in \Phi(\sigma)$ if and only if the line segment joining the points $(i,\sigma(i))$ and $(j,\sigma(j))$ has negative slope.

We have already noted that $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}) = \Delta^+$. The following lemma gives another indication of the importance of w_{o}.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\sigma \in S_n$. Then $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma)$.*

Proof. The graph of $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma$ is obtained from the graph of σ by reflecting in the line $y = n/2$. Using the characterization of $\Phi(\sigma)$ as those positive roots whose corresponding line segment has negative slope completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proposition 2.2. (1) *Suppose $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \ldots \Phi(\sigma_r)$ is a decomposition and let A be any subset of $\{1,2,\ldots,r\}$. Then $\exists \sigma \in S_n$ such that $\Phi(\sigma) = \sqcup_{a\in A}\Phi(\sigma_a)$.*
(2) *Every non-empty inversion set $\Phi(\sigma)$ contains at least one simple root.*

Proof. Clearly it suffices to prove the first assertion for doubleton sets $A = \{p,q\}$. Thus it suffices to show that $\Phi(\sigma_p) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_q)$ is both closed and co-closed. For ease of notation, we will assume $A = \{1,2\}$. First we show that $\Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ is co-closed. Suppose that $(i,j),(j,k) \notin \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Then for $b = 1,2$ we have $(i,k) \notin \Phi(\sigma_b)$ since $\Phi(\sigma_b)$ is co-closed. Thus $(i,k) \notin \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ which shows $\Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ is co-closed.

To see that $\Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ is closed, suppose that $(i,j),(j,k) \in \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Then for $b = 3,4,\ldots,r$ we have $(i,j),(j,k) \notin \Phi(\sigma_b)$ and thus $(i,k) \notin \Phi(\sigma_b)$ since $\Phi(\sigma_b)$ is co-closed. Hence $(i,k) \notin \sqcup_{b=3}^{r}\Phi(\sigma_b)$ which implies that $(i,k) \in \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$. This shows that that $\Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ is closed and completes the proof of the first assertion.

The second assertion follows easily from the fact that if $\sigma(i) < \sigma(i+1)$ for all $i = 1,2,\ldots,n-1$ then $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}_n$. □

Note that the hypothesis that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \dots \Phi(\sigma_r)$ is necessary in the above proposition; arbitrary unions of inversion sets need not be inversion sets. For example, consider $n = 3$, $\sigma_1 = (2,1,3)$ and $\sigma_2 = (1,3,2)$. Then $\Phi(\sigma_1) = \{(1,2)\}$, $\Phi(\sigma_2) = \{(2,3)\}$ and $\Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ is not closed and so is not an inversion set.

The first assertion of Proposition 2.2 implies that if $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$ and A is any subset of $\{1,2,\dots,r\}$ then $\exists \alpha \in S_n$ with $\Phi(\alpha) = \sqcup_{a\in A}\Phi(\sigma_a)$. This fact follows easily from the first assertion of the above proposition and the fact that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_o\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(w_o\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$. In particular, an element $\sigma \in S_n$ is reducible if and only if there exist non-identity elements $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in S_n$ with $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\alpha_1) \sqcup \Phi(\alpha_2)$. Note that we may also write this last equation as the decomposition $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_o\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(\alpha_1) \sqcup \Phi(\alpha_2)$. These considerations show that in our study of decompositions of Δ^+ we may focus our attention on *irreducible decompositions*, i.e., decompositions $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$ where σ_a is irreducible for $a = 1,2,\dots,r$.

Definition 2.3. Two sequences $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ and $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$ each comprised of n distinct real numbers are *order isomorphic* if $x_i > x_j$ if and only if $y_i > y_j$.

Let $\sigma \in S_n$ and suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is some subset of $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ with $m = |\mathcal{F}|$. Write $\mathcal{F} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m$. Restricting σ to $\mathcal{F}$ yields a sequence $\sigma(i_1), \sigma(i_2), \dots, \sigma(i_m)$ which is order isomorphic to the sequence $\mu(1), \mu(2), \dots, \mu(m)$ corresponding to a unique element $\mu \in S_m$. We denote this element μ by $\mu = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$. If $\mathcal{F} \subset \{1,2,\dots,n\}$ we write $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^+$ to denote the set $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^+ := \{(i,j) \in \Delta_n^+ \mid i,j \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

3. INFLATION PROCEDURE

Now we want to describe the inflation procedure for permutations. For a history of the inflation procedure and a discussion of a number of applications we refer the reader to the survey article of Brignall [B].

The following definition will be useful. Write $\{1,2,\dots,n\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_m$ as a disjoint union of ordered intervals. A subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \{1,2,\dots,n\}$ is *admissible* if $|\mathcal{F} \cap I_a| = 1$ for all $a = 1,2,\dots,m$.

In addition to the heuristic description given in §1, we may describe the inflation procedure as follows. Write $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$ as an ordered disjoint union of intervals: $\{1,2,\dots,n\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_m$ where each I_a is an interval and $I_a < I_b$ if $a < b$, i.e., if $a < b$ and $i_a \in I_a, i_b \in I_b$ then $i_a < i_b$. Put $z_a = |I_a|$. Take $\sigma_0 \in S_m$ and $\sigma_a \in S_{z_a}$ for $a = 1,2,\dots,m$. Then $\sigma := \sigma_0[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m]$ is characterized by the following two conditions.

1. $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \sigma_0$ for every admissible $\mathcal{F}$.
2. $\theta_{I_a}(\sigma) = \sigma_a$ for all $a = 1,2,\dots,m$.

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward and is left to the reader.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose* $\alpha = \alpha_0[\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m]$ *where* $\beta_a \in S_{z_a}$ *for* $a = 1,2,\dots,m$. *Define* $I_1 := \{1,2,\dots,z_1\}$, $I_2 := \{z_1+1, z_1+2, \dots, z_1+z_2\}, \dots, I_m := \{z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_{m-1} +$

$1,\dots,n\}$. *Let* Ψ_a *denote the order preserving bijection* $\Psi_a : I_a \to \{1, 2, \dots . z_a\}$. *Then*

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \{(i_a, i_b) \mid i_a \in I_a, i_b \in I_b, (a, b) \in \Phi(\alpha_0)\} \sqcup \left(\sqcup_{a=1}^{m} \Psi_a^{-1}(\Phi(\beta_a))\right) .$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $\sigma_0 \in S_m$ *and let* $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m$ *be positive integers. Put* $n := z_1 + z_2 + \cdots + z_m$. *The permutation* $\sigma := \sigma_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}] \in S_n$ *is irreducible if and only if* σ_0 *is irreducible.*

Proof. Let $\{1, 2, \dots, n\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_m$ be the decomposition into intervals corresponding to the the inflation $\sigma := \sigma_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $\Phi(\sigma) = \{(i, j) \in \Delta_n^+ \mid i \in I_a, j \in I_b, (a, b) \in \Phi(\sigma_0)\}$.

First suppose that σ_0 is reducible and write $\Phi(\sigma_0) = \Phi(\alpha_0) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_0)$. Then $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\alpha) \sqcup \Phi(\beta)$ where $\alpha := \alpha_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_n}]$ and $\beta := \beta_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_n}]$. Thus if σ_0 is irreducible then so is σ.

Next suppose that σ is reducible and write $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\alpha) \sqcup \Phi(\beta)$ where $\alpha, \beta \in S_n$. Consider a positive root $(p, q) \in \Delta_n^+$. Define a and b by $p \in I_a$ and $q \in I_b$. If $a = b$ then $(p, q) \notin \Phi(\sigma)$. Suppose then that $a < b$. Again if $(a, b) \notin \Phi(\sigma_0)$ then $(p, q) \notin \Phi(\sigma)$. Thus we suppose that $(a, b) \in \Phi(\sigma)$. Write $I_a = \{u, u + 1, \dots, u + z_a - 1\}$ and $I_b = \{v, v + 1, \dots, v + z_n - 1\}$. Then $(u + z_a - 1, v) \in \Phi(\sigma)$ and thus, without loss of generality, $(u + z_a - 1, v) \in \Phi(\beta)$. Then $\alpha(u + z_a - 1) < \alpha(v)$. This implies that $(I_a, I_b) \cap \Phi(\alpha) = \emptyset$ where $(I_a, I_b) := \{(i, j) \mid i \in I_a, j \in I_b\}$. Since $(I_a, I_b) \subset \Phi(\sigma)$, this implies that $(I_a, I_b) \subset \Phi(\beta)$. This shows that $\Phi(\beta) = \{(i, j) \mid i \in I_c, j \in I_d, (c, d) \in T\} = \sqcup_{(c,d)\in T}(I_c, I_d)$ for some set $T \subset \Delta_m^+$. Moreover, the fact that $\Phi(\beta)$ is both closed and co-closed implies that the set T is also both closed and co-closed and so $T = \Phi(\beta_0)$ for some non-identity permutation $\beta_0 \in S_m$. This shows that $\beta = \beta_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$. Similarly $\alpha = \alpha_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$ for some non-identity $\alpha_0 \in S_m$. Thus $\Phi(\sigma_0) = \Phi(\alpha_0) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_0)$ is reducible. □

The following proposition follows easily from the two preceding lemmas.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose* $\alpha = \alpha_0[\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m]$ *where* $\beta_a \in S_{z_a}$ *for* $a = 1, 2, \dots, m$. *Let* $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ *and define* $\gamma_a = \begin{cases} \beta_a, & \text{if } a \in A; \\ \mathrm{Id}_{z_a}, & \text{if } a \notin A \end{cases}$ *and* $\gamma'_a = \begin{cases} \mathrm{Id}_{z_a}, & \text{if } a \in A; \\ \beta_a, & \text{if } a \notin A. \end{cases}$ *Define* $\sigma_0 = \alpha_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \dots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_n}]$, $\sigma_1 = \mathrm{Id}[\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m]$ *and* $\sigma_2 = Id[\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \dots, \gamma'_m]$ *Then* $\Phi(\gamma) = \Phi(\sigma_0) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$. *Therefore, if* $\alpha \neq \mathrm{Id}$ *is irreducible, then exactly one of the permutations* $\alpha_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m$ *is a non-identity permutation. In particular, if* α *is irreducible with* $\alpha_0 \neq \mathrm{Id}$ *then* $\alpha = \alpha_0[\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}, \dots . \mathrm{Id}]$ *where* α_0 *is irreducible.* □

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $\sigma \in S_n$. *The permutation* σ *is simple if and only if* $w_o\sigma$ *is simple.*

Proof. This result follows immediately from the fact that that the graph of $w_o\sigma$ is obtained from the graph of σ by reflecting in the line $y = n/2$. □

Definition 3.5. Let $\sigma \in S_n$, and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. If $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^+ \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{F}'}^+ \neq \emptyset$ then we say that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are *σ-connected*. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ be subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. If there exist subsets $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_t \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1$, $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}_t$ and $\mathcal{F}_a$ is σ-connected to $\mathcal{F}_{a+1}$ for $a = 1, 2, \ldots, t-1$ then we say that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are *σ-path-connected.*

We will make use of the following lemma a number of times.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\sigma \in S_n$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Write $\mu = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ and $\mu' = \theta_{\mathcal{F}'}(\theta)$. Suppose that $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$.*

1. *If μ is irreducible then there exists $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ with $1 \leq \delta(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$ such that $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \subset \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F})})$.*
2. *If μ and μ' are both irreducible and $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-path connected then $\delta(\mathcal{F}) = \delta(\mathcal{F}')$.*

Proof. Let $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ and suppose that μ is irreducible. Put $\mu_a = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma_a)$ for $a = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. There exists an order preserving bijection $\Psi : \mathcal{F} \to \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. It is easy to see that $(i, j) \in \Phi(\alpha) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}}$ if and only if $(\Psi(i), \Psi(j)) \in \Phi(\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in S_n$. Thus Ψ identifies $\Phi(\alpha) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}}$ with $\Phi(\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha))$. Intersecting $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$ with $\Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}}$ and using this identification we get $\Phi(\mu) = \Phi(\mu_1) \sqcup \Phi(\mu_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\mu_r)$. Since μ is irreducible, there exists $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\Phi(\mu) \subset \Phi(\mu_{\delta(\mathcal{F})})$. Therefore $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \subset \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F})})$.

For the second assertion, suppose that μ and μ' are irreducible. Clearly it suffices to consider the case where $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-connected. By the above, $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \subset \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F})})$ and $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}'} \subset \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F}')})$. But $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-connected implies that there exists $(i, j) \in \Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}'}$. Thus $(i, j) \in \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F})}) \cap \Phi(\sigma_{\delta(\mathcal{F}')})$. Hence $\delta(\mathcal{F}) = \delta(\mathcal{F}')$. □

Corollary 3.7. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_s \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ where $\mathcal{F}_i$ and $\mathcal{F}_j$ are σ-path-connected for all $1 \leq i, j \leq s$. Further suppose that $\theta_{\mathcal{F}_i}(\sigma)$ is irreducible for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ and $\Phi(\sigma) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{s} \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}_i}$. Then σ is irreducible.*

Proof. Suppose that $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$. By the lemma, we have $j = \delta(\mathcal{F}_1) = \delta(\mathcal{F}_2) = \cdots = \delta(\mathcal{F}_r)$ with $\Phi(\theta) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}_i} \subset \Phi(\sigma_j)$. Therefore $\Phi(\sigma) = \sqcup_{i=1}^{r} (\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}_i}) \subset \Phi(\sigma_j)$ and thus the decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$ is trivial. □

Remark 3.8. Suppose $\sigma = \sigma_0[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m]$ where σ_0 is irreducible. Further suppose that the sets $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_t$ are all admissible (with respect to σ). If the $\mathcal{F}_i$ are all σ-path connected and $\Phi(\sigma) \subset \cup_{i=1}^{s} \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ then the above corollary applies and shows that σ is irreducible.

Definition 3.9. A permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is *atomic* if $\sigma(i+1) \neq \sigma(i) + 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$.

Definition 3.10. Let $n = 2m$ be even with $n \geq 4$. A permutation σ is *exceptional* if σ is one of the following permutations

1. $\sigma = (2, 4, 6, \ldots, n-2, n, 1, 3, 5, \ldots, n-3, n-1)$,
2. $\sigma = (m+1, 1, m+2, 2, m+3, 3, \ldots, 2m-1, m-1, 2m, m)$,
3. $\sigma = (n-1, n-3, n-5, \ldots, 3, 1, n, n-2, n-4, \ldots, 4, 2)$,

(4) $\sigma = (m, 2m, m-1, 2m-1, m-2, 2m-2, \dots, 2, m+2, 1, m+1)$.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\sigma \in S_n$ be exceptional. Then σ is atomic and irreducible.*

Proof. It is easily seen that all of these permutations are atomic.

(1) Suppose $\sigma = (2, 4, 6, \dots, n-2, n, 1, 3, 5, \dots, n-3, n-1)$. Then $\Phi(\sigma)$ has only one simple root, $(m, m+1)$ and so is irreducible.

For the remaining cases, we proceed by induction and use Corollary 3.7 repeatedly. If $n = 4$, it is easy to check that the only two exceptional permutations (2,4,1,3) and (3,1,4,2) are irreducible. To prove the induction step, let $n \geq 6$.

(2) Suppose $\sigma = (m+1, 1, m+2, 2, m+3, 3, \dots, 2m-1, m-1, 2m, m)$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m-2\}$ and $\mathcal{F}' := \{3, 4, \dots, 2m\}$. We let $\mu = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{F}'}(\sigma)$. Then $\mu = (m+1, 1, m+2, 2, m+3, 3, \dots, 2m-1, m-1)$ is again exceptional and so is irreducible by the induction hypothesis. Furthermore $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-connected since $(3,4) \in \Phi(\sigma)$ with $3, 4 \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{F}'$. Now $\Phi(\sigma) \cap (\Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}'}) = \Phi(\sigma) \setminus \{(2, 2m)\}$. If we take $\mathcal{F}'' = \{2, 3, 2m-1, 2m\}$ then $\theta_{\mathcal{F}''}(\sigma) = (3, 1, 2, 4)$ is irreducible with $(2, 2m) \in \Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}''}$ and $(2, 3) \in \Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}''}$. Hence Corollary 3.7 implies that σ is irreducible.

(3) Suppose $\sigma = (n-1, n-3, n-5, \dots, 3, 1, n, n-2, n-4, \dots, 4, 2)$. Take $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{1, m+1\}$ and $\mathcal{F}' = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{m, 2m\}$. Then $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{F}'}(\sigma) = \sigma = (n-3, n-5, \dots, 3, 1, n-2, n-4, \dots, 4, 2)$ is again exceptional and so is irreducible by the induction hypothesis. Also the root $(2, 2m-1)$ shows that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-connected. Then $\Phi(\sigma) \cap (\Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}'}) = \Phi(\sigma) \setminus \{(1, m), (1, 2m), (m+1, 2m)\}$. For $\mathcal{F}'' = \{1, m, m+1, 2m\}$ we have $\theta_{\mathcal{F}''}(\sigma) = (3, 1, 4, 2)$ which is irreducible with $\Phi(\sigma) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}''} = \{(1, m), (1, 2m), (m+1, 2m)\}$. Finally if we take $\mathcal{F}''' = \{2, m, m+1, 2m\}$ we have $\theta_{\mathcal{F}'''}(\theta) = (3, 1, 4, 2)$ and $\mathcal{F}'''$ is σ-connected to both $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}''$ since $(2, m), (m+1, 2m) \in \Phi(\sigma)$. Thus σ is irreducible.

(4) Finally suppose that $\sigma = (m, 2m, m-1, 2m-1, m-2, 2m-2, \dots, 2, m+2, 1, m+1)$. It is straightforward to verify that $\sigma = (3, 6, 2, 5, 1, 4)$ is irreducible. Thus we suppose $2m \geq 8$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\} \setminus \{2, 2m-1\}$, $\mathcal{F}' = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\} \setminus \{m, 2m\}$ and $\mathcal{F}'' = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m\} \setminus \{1, m+1\}$. Then $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{F}'}(\sigma) = \theta_{\mathcal{F}'}(\sigma) = (m-1, 2m-2, m-2, 2m-3, \dots, 2, m+1, 1, m)$ is exceptional and so is irreducible by induction. Also $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are σ-connected by $(1, 3)$ and $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}''$ are σ-connected by $(2m-2, 2m)$. Since $\Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}} \cup \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}'} \cup \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}''} = \Delta^+_{2m}$, Corollary 3.7 implies that σ is irreducible. □

Definition 3.12. Let $\sigma \in S_n$. Choose k with $1 \leq k \leq n$ and put $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$. The permutation $\sigma^\circ = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) \in S_{n-1}$ is called a *one point deletion* of σ.

The following theorem, expressed in the language of posets, was first proved by Schmerl and Trotter [ST]. For a proof using permutations we refer the reader to [AA][Theorem 5].

Theorem 3.13. *Let $n \geq 2$ and suppose $\sigma \in S_n$ is simple but not exceptional. Then σ has a one point deletion σ° which is simple.* □

Proposition 3.14. *Let $\sigma \in S_n$ with $n \geq 4$. The permutation σ is simple if and only if it is atomic and irreducible.*

Proof. First suppose σ is atomic and irreducible and express σ in simple form: $\sigma = \sigma_0[\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m]$ with $\beta_a \in S_{z_a}$ for $a = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. By Lemma 3.2, exactly one of the permutations $\sigma_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m$ is a non-identity permutation. If $\sigma_0 = \mathrm{Id}_m$ then the simplicity of σ implies that $\beta_1 \neq \mathrm{Id}$. Similarly, if $\sigma_0 = \mathrm{Id}_m$ we cannot have $\beta_m = \mathrm{Id}$. Thus $\sigma_0 \neq \mathrm{Id}$. Therefore $\sigma = \sigma_0[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$. Since σ is atomic, this implies that $z_a = 1$ for all a. But then $\sigma = \sigma_0$ is simple.

Next we suppose that σ is simple. It follows immediately, from the definition that σ is atomic. We prove that simple implies irreducible by induction. For the base case, we have $n = 4$ and this implies that σ is exceptional. Thus σ is irreducible by Lemma 3.11.

We prove the induction step by contradiction. Suppose $n \geq 5$ and that $\sigma \in S_n$ is simple. If σ is exceptional then the result follows from Lemma 3.11. Thus we suppose that σ is not exceptional and assume by way of contradiction that $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Let the simple permutation $\sigma^\circ \in S_{n-1}$ be a one point deletion of σ. By the induction hypothesis, σ° is irreducible. Suppose that $\sigma^\circ = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma)$ where $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$ and $\sigma(k) = \ell$. Since σ° is irreducible we may assume without loss of generality that $\{(i, j) \in \Phi(\sigma) \mid i \neq k, j \neq k\} \subseteq \Phi(\sigma_1)$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that $\Phi(\sigma_2) \neq \emptyset$. Write $\Phi(\sigma_2) = \{(i_1, k), (i_2, k), \ldots, (i_p, k)\} \sqcup \{(k, i'_1), (k, i'_2), \ldots, (k, i'_q)\}$ and $j_a = \sigma(i_a)$ for $a = 1, 2, \ldots, p$ and $j'_a = \sigma(i'_a)$ for $a = 1, 2, \ldots a$.

Define $s = \max\{k - i_a, j_a - \ell \mid 1 \leq a \leq p\}$. We consider two cases. For the first case, suppose that $s = k - i_b$ for some b with $1 \leq b \leq p$. If $s = n - 1$ then we must have $k = n$ and $i_b = 1$. Since σ is simple, $j_b \neq 1$ and $\ell \neq 1$. Hence, $i_0 := \sigma^{-1}(1)$ satisfies $1 < i_0 < k = n$. Taking $\mathcal{F} = \{1, i_0, n\}$, we find $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (312)$. Then θ carries the decomposition $\Phi(\sigma) = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2)$ to a non-trivial decomposition of (312) since $(1, i_0) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$ and $(1, n) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$. This contradiction shows $s \neq n - 1$.

The $s \times s$ square $\square_s := [k - s, k] \times [\ell, \ell + s]$ is contained in $[1, n] \times [1, n]$. Since σ is simple and $1 \leq s \leq n - 2$, the graph of σ has at most s points within $\square_s$. Then the simplicity of σ implies that there is a point $V = (i_0, j_0)$ of the graph of σ either strictly above $\square_s$ or strictly below $\square_s$. If V is above $\square_s$, i.e, if $k - s \leq i_0 \leq k$ and $\ell + s < j_0$ then taking $\mathcal{F} = \{i_b, i_0, k\}$, we find $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (231)$. Then θ the decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$ induces a non-trivial decomposition of (231) since $(i_b, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$ and $(i_0, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$. This contradiction shows V must be strictly below $\square_s$. Thus $k - s \leq i_0 \leq k$ and $j_0 < \ell$. For $\mathcal{F} = \{i_b, i_0, k\}$, we have $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (312)$. This yields a non-trivial decomposition of (312) since $(i_b, i_0) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$ and $(i_b, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Again we have a contradiction.

For the second case, suppose that $s = j_b - \ell$ for some b with $1 \leq b \leq p$. If $s = n - 1$, then $j_b = n$ and $\ell = 1$. The simplicity of σ implies that $i_b \neq n$ and $k \neq n$. With $\mathcal{F} = \{i_b, k, n\}$ we have $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (312)$. Since $(i_b, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$ and $(i_b, n) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$, the decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$ induces a non-trivial decomposition of (312). This contradiction shows that $s \neq n - 1$,

Therefore $1 \leq s \leq n - 2$, By the simplicity of σ, the square $\square_s$ contains at most s points of the graph of σ. Hence there is a point $V = (i_0, j_0)$ of the graph of σ either strictly to the right of $\square_s$ or strictly to the left of $\square_s$. If V is to the left of $\square_s$, i.e, if $i_0 < k - s \leq i_b < k$ and $\ell \leq j_0 \leq \ell + s$ then we consider $\mathcal{F} = \{i_0, i_b, k\}$. Then $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (231)$. By the definition of

s, we have $(i_0, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$ Also $(i_b, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Hence the decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$ induces a non-trivial decomposition of (231), a contradiction. Conversely, if V is to the right of $\square_s$ then $i_b < k < i_0$ and $\ell \leq j_0 \leq \ell + s$. Taking $\mathcal{F} = \{i_b, k, i_0\}$ we have $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) = (312)$. Now $(i_b, k) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$ and $(i_b, i_0) \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$. Thus the decomposition of $\Phi(\sigma)$ yields a non-trivial decomposition of (312), a contradiction.

These contradictions imply that $p = 0$, i.e., there are no roots of the form (i_a, k) in $\Phi(\sigma_2)$. The same proof works, mutatis mutandis, to show that there are no roots of the form $(k, i'_a) \in \Phi(\sigma_2)$. Thus $\Phi(\sigma_2)$ must be empty and so $\Phi(\sigma)$ is irreducible as required. □

The following corollary follows immediately from Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.14. The corollary is required for our proof of Theorem 1.9 and is the motivation for proving Proposition 3.14.

Corollary 3.15. *Suppose that $\sigma \in S_n$ is simple. Then $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma$ is irreducible.* □

We now give our proof of Theorem 1.9

Proof. First we suppose that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_r)$ is an irreducible decomposition. Without loss of generality, the highest root $(1, n)$ is an element of $\Phi(w_1)$. Express $w_1 = \sigma_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1m}]$ in simple form. It is easy to see that $(1, n) \in \Phi(w_1)$ implies that $\sigma_1 \neq \mathrm{Id}$.

By Lemma 3.2, σ_1 is irreducible. If $\sigma_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]$ this implies that $m = 2$ since $\Delta_m^+ = \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]) = \Phi(\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]\sigma)$ gives a non-trivial decomposition for any $\sigma \in S_m \backslash \{w_{\mathrm{o}}[m], \mathrm{Id}_m\}$ when $m \geq 3$. Since w_1 is irreducible, by Lemma 3.2, we must have $w_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[2][\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}]$ if w_1 is minus-decomposable.

If $\sigma_1 \neq w_{\mathrm{o}}$, then σ_1 must be simple and $m \geq 4$. Let $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_m$ be the intervals corresponding to the simple form $w_1 = \sigma_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1m}]$ with $|I_a| = z_a$. Since w_1 is irreducible, we must have $w_1 = \sigma_1[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$. We have $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1) = \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_r)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an admissible set. Then $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_1) = \sigma_1$. Since $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}[n]w_1) = \Phi(w_1)^{\mathrm{c}}$, we must have $w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1 = (w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)[w_{\mathrm{o}}, w_{\mathrm{o}}, \ldots, w_{\mathrm{o}}]$. Then since $\mathcal{F}$ is admissible, $\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1) = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1$. The element $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1$ is simple by Corollary 3.15. Applying Lemma 3.6, we see that there exists $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1) \subset \Phi(w_{\delta(\mathcal{F})})$.

Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is admissible and $1 \leq a \leq m$. We claim that there exists a root $(s, t) \in \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)$ $s \neq a$ and $t \neq a$. This is clear since otherwise $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma$ has Id_{m-1} as a one point deletion. Since $m \geq 4$, it is clear that this cannot happen since $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma$ is simple. If $|I_a| > 1$ then let $i_a \in \mathcal{F} \cap I_a$ and $i'_a \in I_a \setminus \mathcal{F}$ and construct a new admissible set by replacing i_a by i'_a, i.e., $\mathcal{F}' := (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{i_a\}) \cup \{i'_a\}$. Write $\{i_s\} = I_s \cap \mathcal{F} = I_s \cap F'$ and $\{i_t\} = I_t \cap \mathcal{F} = I_t \cap F'$. Since $(s, t) \in \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)$ it follows that $(i_s, i_t) \in \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1) \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^+ \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{F}'}^+$. Therefore $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are $w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1$-connected. From this it follows that any two admissible sets are $w_{\mathrm{o}}w_1$-path-connected. This implies that $\delta(\mathcal{F})$ is constant for all admissible sets $\mathcal{F}$. Without loss of generality, we have $\delta(\mathcal{F}) = 2$ for all admissible sets $\mathcal{F}$.

Hence $\Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1) \subset \Phi(\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_2))$. Assume, by way of contradiction, that this is a proper inclusion. Then there exists $(a, b) \in \Phi(\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_2)) \backslash \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)$. Then $(i_a, i_b) \in \Phi(w_1) \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{F}}^+$ where

$\{i_a\} = \mathcal{F} \cap I_a$ and $\{i_b\} = I_b \cap \mathcal{F}$. But $(a,b) \in \Phi(\theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_2))$ implies that $(i_a, i_b) \in \Phi(w_2) \cap \Delta^+_{\mathcal{F}}$. Thus $(i_a, i_b) \in \Phi(w_1) \cap \Phi(w_2)$. This contradiction shows that $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1 = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_2)$.

Since $w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1 = \theta_{\mathcal{F}}(w_2)$ for all admissible sets $\mathcal{F}$, we see that

$$\{(i_a, i_b) \in \Phi(w_2) \mid i_a \in I_a, i_b \in I_b, a \neq b\} = \{(i_a, i_b) \in \Delta^+_n \mid i_a \in I_a, i_b \in I_b, (a,b) \in \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)\}\,.$$

Hence $\Phi(w_2) = \{(i_a, i_b) \in \Delta^+_n \mid i_a \in I_a, i_b \in I_b, (a,b) \in \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1)\} \sqcup \Big(\sqcup_{b=1}^m \Delta^+_{I_b} \cap \Phi(w_2)\Big)$. From this it is clear that $w_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1[\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \ldots, \beta_{2m}]$ where $\beta_{2b} = \theta_{I_b}(w_2)$ for all $b = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

But since $\Phi(w_2)$ is irreducible, we must have $\beta_{21} = \beta_{22} = \cdots = \beta_{2m} = \mathrm{Id}$ and therefore $w_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1[\mathrm{Id}_{z_1}, \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id}_{z_m}]$ as required.

Hence we have shown

$$w_1 = \begin{cases} w_{\mathrm{o}}[2][\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}], & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \sigma_1[\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id}] \text{ and } w_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1[\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id}], & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$\{(i,j) \in \Delta^+_n \mid i \in I_a, j \in I_b, a \neq b\} = \begin{cases} \Phi(w_1), & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2), & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

From this it follows that all other w_a have the form $w_a = \mathrm{Id}_m[\beta_{a1}, \beta_{a2}, \ldots, \beta_{am}]$. Let Ψ_b denote the order preserving bijection $\Psi_b : I_b \to \{1, 2, \ldots, z_b\}$ for $b = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Then $\Phi(w_a) = \sqcup_{b=1}^m \Psi^{-1}(\Phi(\beta_{ab}))$ for all $a = 3, 4, \ldots, r$. Thus we have shown that the characterization of irreducible decompositions given in the statement of the theorem is correct.

For general decompositions we use the fact that every decomposition may be realized by beginning with an irreducible decomposition and then merging some collections of the irreducible inversion sets. We consider the effect of such mergers by examining effect of merging pairs of inversion sets.

Let $w = \sigma[\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m]$ and $w' = \sigma'[\beta'_1, \beta'_2, \ldots, \beta'_m]$ with $\beta_b, \beta'_b \in S_{z_b}$ for $b = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ and $\sigma, \sigma' \in S_n$. It is easy to see that

$$\Phi(w) \sqcup \Phi(w') = \Phi(\mu)$$

where $\mu = \nu[\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_m]$ where $\Phi(\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma') = \Phi(\nu)$ and $\Phi(\beta_b) \sqcup \Phi(\beta'_b) = \Phi(\gamma_b)$ for $b = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

Since $\Phi(\sigma) \sqcup \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma) = \Phi(w_{\mathrm{o}})$, it follows that the characterization of general decompositions given in the statement of the theorem is correct. □

4. Decompositions for Type B

Here we consider root systems of type B_n. In this section and the next, we will consider the Weyl group $\mathcal{W}(A_m) \cong S_{m+1}$ as the group of all permutations of the set $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{m+1}\}$. With this notation, the positive roots are $\Delta^+_{A_m} = \{(i,j) = e_i - e_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq m\}$.

We denote the positive roots for the root system of type B_n by

$$\Delta^+_{B_n} = \{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \sqcup \{\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \sqcup \{\varepsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

The set of simple roots in $\Delta^+_{B_n}$ is $\{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \sqcup \{\varepsilon_n\}$.

For type B_n the Weyl group $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$ is the set of signed permutations of the set

$$\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n, 0, -\varepsilon_n, \dots, -\varepsilon_2, -\varepsilon_1\}.$$

These are the permutations σ of this set such that $\sigma(0) = 0$ and $\sigma(-\varepsilon_i) = -\sigma(\varepsilon_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Abstractly, $\mathcal{W}(B_n) \cong S_n \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$.

For $1 \leq i \leq 2n+1$ we define $i' := (2n+2) - i$. It is convenient to define $\varepsilon_i = -\varepsilon_{i'}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n+1$ and $\varepsilon_{n+1} = 0$.

We embed $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$ in $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$ by the group homomorphism $\sigma \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}$ where $\tilde{\sigma}(e_i) = e_k$ if $\sigma(\varepsilon_i) = \varepsilon_k$. The condition that $\sigma(-\varepsilon_i) = -\sigma(\varepsilon_i)$ implies that if $\tilde{\sigma}(e_i) = e_k$ then $\tilde{\sigma}(e_{i'}) = e_{k'}$. This condition is equivalent to the condition that the graph of $\tilde{\sigma}$ is invariant under a rotation of π radians about the point $(n+1, n+1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We say that a permutation in S_{2n+1} is *symmetric* if it satisfies these two equivalent conditions.

Consider the involution μ of $\Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$ induced by $\mu(e_i) = -e_{i'}$. Note that the elements of $\Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$ fixed pointwise by μ are precisely the positive roots $e_i - e_{i'}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

We define the map $\rho : \Delta_{A_{2n}} \to \Delta_{B_n}$ by $\rho(e_i - e_j) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j, & \text{if } j \neq i', i; \\ \varepsilon_i = (\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j)/2 & \text{if } j = i'. \end{cases}$

Since $\tilde{\sigma}(e_i - e_{i'}) = e_k - e_{k'}$ we have $\sigma(\rho(\alpha)) = \rho(\tilde{\sigma}(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{A_{2n}}$. Observe that $\rho(\mu(\alpha)) = \rho(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$.

Suppose $\alpha = e_i - e_j \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$.

Observe that $\rho(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j, & \text{if } 1 \leq i < j \leq n; \\ \varepsilon_i, & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n, j = n+1; \\ \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{j'}, & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n, n+2 \leq j \leq 2n+1 \text{ with } j \neq i'; \\ \varepsilon_i, & \text{if } 1 \leq i = j' \leq n; \\ \varepsilon_{j'}, & \text{if } i = n+1 < j \leq 2n+1; \\ \varepsilon_{i'} - \varepsilon_{j'}, & \text{if } n+2 \leq i < j \leq 2n+1. \end{cases}$.

Thus $\rho(\Delta^+_{A_{2n}}) = \Delta^+_{B_n}$. Clearly $\rho(\Delta^-_{A_{2n}}) = \Delta^-_{B_n}$ also.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose* $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$. *Then* $\rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma})) = \Phi(\sigma)$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$ and let $\beta = \tilde{\sigma}(\alpha)$. Then $\rho(\alpha) \in \Delta^+_{B_n}$. Now $\alpha \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ if and only if $\beta \in \Delta^-_{A_{2n}}$ if and only $\rho(\beta) \in \Delta^-_{B_n}$. Since $\rho(\beta) = \sigma(\rho(\alpha))$ this implies $\alpha \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ if and only if $\rho(\alpha) \in \Phi(\sigma)$. Thus $\rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma})) = \Phi(\sigma)$ □

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$ *and let* $1 \leq i \leq n$. *Then* $e_i - e_{n+1} \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ *if and only if* $e_i - e_{i'} \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$. *Furthermore* $\alpha \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ *if and only if* $\mu(\alpha) \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ *for all* $\alpha \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$. *In particular, if* $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}) \cap \rho^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$ *then* $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}) \supset \rho^{-1}(\gamma)$ *for all* $\gamma \in \Delta^+_{B_n}$.

Proof. First we suppose that $e_i - e_{n+1} \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$. Then $\mu(e_i - e_{n+1}) = e_{n+1} - e_{i'} \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$. Hence by the closed property $e_i - e_{i'} = (e_i - e_{n+1}) + (e_{n+1} - e_{i'}) \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$.

Conversely, suppose $e_i - e_{n+1} \notin \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$. Then $\mu(e_i - e_{n+1}) = e_{n+1} - e_{i'} \notin \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ and the co-closed property shows that $e_i - e_{i'} \notin \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$.

For the second assertion write $\alpha = e_i - e_j$ (with $i < j$) and write $\tilde{\sigma}(\alpha) = e_k - e_\ell$. Then $\tilde{\sigma}(\mu(\alpha)) = \tilde{\sigma}(e_{j'} - e_{i'}) = e_{\ell'} - e_{k'}$. Hence $\alpha \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$ if and only if $k > \ell$ if and only if $\ell' > k'$ if and only if $\mu(\alpha) \in \Phi(\tilde{\sigma})$.

The final assertion follows from the above. □

The following corollary follows immediately from the preceding lemma.

Corollary 4.3. *Let* $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$ *with* $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \cap \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2) = \emptyset$. *Then* $\rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \sqcup \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2)) = \rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1)) \sqcup \rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2))$. *In particular, suppose* $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$. *Then* $\Delta^+_{B_n} = \sqcup_{i=1}^r \Phi(\sigma_r)$ *if and only if* $\Delta^+_{A_{2n}} = \sqcup_{i=1}^r \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_r)$. *Furthermore the element* $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$ *is indecomposable if and only if* $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$ *is indecomposable.* □

The embedding of $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$ into $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$ allows us to define an inflation operation for Weyl groups of type B as follows. Let $m \leq n$ and let $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \ldots I_r$ be a decomposition into intervals. Put $z_t = |I_t|$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Suppose that $\sigma_0 \in \mathcal{W}(B_r)$, $\tau_{r+1} \in \mathcal{W}(B_{n-m})$ and $\tau_t \in S_{z_t}$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. We form the inflation $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}_0[\tau 1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_r, \tilde{\tau}_{r+1}, \tau_{r+2}, \ldots, \tau_{2r+1}]$ where $\tau_{2r+2-t} = w_{\mathrm{o}} \tau_t w_{\mathrm{o}}$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Then $\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$ is symmetric and so corresponds to an element $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$. We say that σ is an inflation in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$.

An element $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$ which cannot be realized as such an inflation in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$ except with $r = 0$ or $r = n$ is said to be simple in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$.

The proof of the following lemma is straight forward and left to the reader.

Lemma 4.4. *If* $\alpha[\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_s] \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$ *is symmetric then* α *must be symmetric,* s *is odd, and* $\tau_{s+1-t} = w_{\mathrm{o}} \tau_t w_{\mathrm{o}}$ *for all* $t = 1, 2, \ldots, s$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let* $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$. *Then* σ *is simple in* $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$ *if and only if* $\tilde{\sigma}$ *is simple (in* $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$*).*

Proof. If $\tilde{\sigma}$ is simple in $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n})$, then $\tilde{\sigma}$ cannot be realized as a non-trivial inflation and so cannot be realized as a non-trivial inflation in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$.

Conversely, suppose that σ is simple in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$. Assume by way of contradiction that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is not simple. Then $\tilde{\sigma} = \alpha[\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_s]$. Since $\tilde{\sigma} \in S_{2n+1}$ is symmetric, Lemma 4.4 shows that σ is an inflation in $\mathcal{W}(B_n)$. □

Theorem 4.6. *Let* $\Delta^+_{B_n} = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_r)$ *be a decomposition with all* $\Phi(w_a) \neq \emptyset$*. Then (after possibly reordering) we have*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \tilde{w}_1 & = & \tilde{\sigma}_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1(2s+1)}] \\ \tilde{w}_2 & = & \tilde{\sigma}_2[\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \ldots, \beta_{2(2s+1)}] \\ & \vdots & \\ \tilde{w}_r & = & \tilde{\sigma}_r[\beta_{r1}, \beta_{r2}, \ldots, \beta_{r(2s+1)}] \end{array}$$

where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in \mathcal{W}(B_s)$*,* $\beta_{qt} = w_{\mathrm{o}} \beta_{q(2s+2-t)} w_{\mathrm{o}}$ *for all* $q = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ *and all* $t = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s+1$ *and*

$$(\dagger) \quad \Phi(\beta_{1b}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{2b}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{rb}) = \Delta^+_{A_{z_b}} \text{ is a decomposition} \qquad \forall b = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s+1$$

and $\sigma_q = \sigma_{q+1} = \cdots = \sigma_r = \mathrm{Id}$ *with*

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[2s+1] \text{ and } q = 2, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \sigma_1 \text{ is } \mathcal{W}(B_s) \text{ simple, } \tilde{\sigma}_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\tilde{\sigma}_1 \text{ and } q = 3, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the above decomposition of $\Delta^+_{B_n}$ *is irreducible if and only if the decompositions* $(\dagger)$ *are irreducible for all* b*, exactly one of* $\beta_{a1}, \beta_{a2}, \ldots, \beta_{a(s+1)}$ *is not equal to* Id *for each* $a = q, q+1, \ldots, r$*, and*

$$\begin{cases} s = 1 \text{ and } \beta_{11} = \beta_{13} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_1} \text{ and } \beta_{12} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \beta_{1b} = \beta_{2b} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_b} \text{ for all } b = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s+1, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

5. DECOMPOSITIONS FOR TYPE C

In this section we consider root systems of type C_n.

We denote the positive roots for the root system of type C_n by

$$\Delta^+_{B_n} = \{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \sqcup \{\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}.$$

The set of simple roots in $\Delta^+_{C_n}$ is $\{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \sqcup \{2\varepsilon_n\}$.

The Weyl group $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$ is the set of signed permutations of the set

$$\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_n, -\varepsilon_n, \ldots, -\varepsilon_2, -\varepsilon_1\}.$$

Abstractly, $\mathcal{W}(C_n) \cong \mathcal{W}(B_n) \cong S_n \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$.

For $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ we define $i' := (2n+1) - i$ and put $\varepsilon_i = -\varepsilon_{i'}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$.

We embed $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$ in $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n-1})$ by the group homomorphism $\sigma \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}$ where $\tilde{\sigma}(e_i) = e_k$ if $\sigma(\varepsilon_i) = \varepsilon_k$. Again the condition that $\sigma(-\varepsilon_i) = -\sigma(\varepsilon_i)$ implies that if $\tilde{\sigma}(e_i) = e_k$ then $\tilde{\sigma}(e_{i'}) = e_{k'}$. This condition is equivalent to the condition that the graph of $\tilde{\sigma}$ is invariant under a rotation of π radians about the point $(n + 1/2, n + 1/2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We say that a permutation in S_{2n} is *symmetric* if it satisfies these two equivalent conditions.

As in the previous section, we define μ to be the involution of $\Delta^+_{A_{2n-1}}$ induced by $\mu(e_i) = -e_{i'}$. Then μ has no fixed points in $\Delta^+_{A_{2n-1}}$.

We define the map $\rho : \Delta_{A_{2n-1}} \to \Delta_{C_n}$ by $\rho(e_i - e_j) = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j$. Then $\rho(\mu(\alpha)) = \rho(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n}}$.

Suppose $\alpha = e_i - e_j \in \Delta^+_{A_{2n-1}}$.

$$\text{Then } \rho(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j, & \text{if } 1 \le i < j \le n; \\ \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{j'}, & \text{if } 1 \le i \le n, n+1 \le j \le 2n \text{ with } j \ne i'; \\ 2\varepsilon_i, & \text{if } 1 \le i = j' \le n; \\ \varepsilon_{i'} - \varepsilon_{j'}, & \text{if } n+1 \le i < j \le 2n. \end{cases}.$$

Thus $\rho(\Delta^+_{A_{2n-1}}) = \Delta^+_{C_n}$ and $\rho(\Delta^-_{A_{2n-1}}) = \Delta^-_{C_n}$.

As in the previous section, this implies that $\rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma})) = \Phi(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$. Also if $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}) \cap \rho^{-1}(\gamma) \ne \emptyset$ then $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}) \supset \rho^{-1}(\gamma)$ for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ and $\gamma \in \Delta_{C_n}$.

The following corollary follows the above considerations.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ with $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \cap \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2) = \emptyset$. Then $\rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \sqcup \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2)) = \rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1)) \sqcup \rho(\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_2))$. In particular, suppose $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$. Then $\Delta^+_{C_n} = \sqcup_{i=1}^r \Phi(\sigma_r)$ if and only if $\Delta^+_{A_{2n-1}} = \sqcup_{i=1}^r \Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_r)$. Furthermore the element $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ is indecomposable if and only if $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n-1})$ is indecomposable.* ☐

As before, the embedding of $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$ into $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n-1})$ allows us to define an inflation operation for Weyl groups of type C as follows. Let $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \ldots I_r$ be a decomposition into intervals. Put $z_t = |I_t|$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Suppose that $\sigma_0 \in \mathcal{W}(C_r)$ and $\tau_t \in S_{z_t}$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. We form the inflation $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{\sigma}_0[\tau 1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_r, \tilde{\tau}_{r+1}, \ldots, \tau_{2r}]$ where $\tau_{2r+1-t} = w_o \tau_t w_o$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Then $\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n-1})$ is symmetric and so corresponds to an element $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$. We say that σ is an inflation in $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$.

An element $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ which cannot be realized as such an inflation in $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$ except with $r = 1$ or $r = n$ is said to be simple in $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$.

As before we have have the following two results.

Lemma 5.2. *If $\alpha[\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_s] \in \mathcal{W}(A_{2n-1})$ is symmetric then α must be symmetric, s is even and $\tau_{s+1-t} = w_o \tau_t w_o$ for all $t = 1, 2, \ldots, s$.*

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}(C_n)$. Then σ is simple in $\mathcal{W}(C_n)$ if and only if $\tilde{\sigma}$ is simple (in $\mathcal{W}(A_{2n-2})$).*

Finally we obtain the analogue of Theorem 1.9 for type C.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\Delta^+_{C_n} = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_r)$ be a decomposition with all $\Phi(w_a) \ne \emptyset$. Then (after possibly reordering) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}_1 &= \tilde{\sigma}_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1(2s)}] \\ \tilde{w}_2 &= \tilde{\sigma}_2[\beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, \ldots, \beta_{2(2s)}] \\ &\vdots \\ \tilde{w}_r &= \tilde{\sigma}_r[\beta_{r1}, \beta_{r2}, \ldots, \beta_{r(2s)}] \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_r \in \mathcal{W}(C_s)$*,* $\beta_{qt} = w_{\mathrm{o}}\beta_{q(2s+1-t)}w_{\mathrm{o}}$ *for all* $q = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ *and all* $t = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s$ *and*

$$(\dagger) \quad \Phi(\beta_{1b}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{2b}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{rb}) = \Delta^+_{A_{z_b}} \text{ is a decomposition} \qquad \forall b = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s$$

and $\sigma_q = \sigma_{q+1} = \cdots = \sigma_r = \mathrm{Id}$ *with*

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[2s] \text{ and } q = 2, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \sigma_1 \text{ is } \mathcal{W}(C_s) \text{ simple, } \tilde{\sigma}_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\tilde{\sigma}_1 \text{ and } q = 3, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the above decomposition of $\Delta^+_{C_n}$ *is irreducible if and only if the decompositions* $(\dagger)$ *are irreducible for all* b*, exactly one of* $\beta_{a1}, \beta_{a2}, \ldots, \beta_{as}$ *is not equal to* Id *for each* $a = q, q+1, \ldots, r$*, and*

$$\begin{cases} s = 1 \text{ and } \beta_{11} = \beta_{13} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_1} \text{ and } \beta_{12} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_2}, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-decomposable;} \\ \beta_{1b} = \beta_{2b} = \mathrm{Id}_{z_b} \text{ for all } b = 1, 2, \ldots, 2s, & \text{if } w_1 \text{ is minus-indecomposable.} \end{cases}$$

6. Enumerative Results

The inductive description for a decomposition provided by Theorems 1.9, 4.6, and 5.4 allows us to use generating series or recursion to enumerate many different types of decompositions. We give a few examples.

Let s_n be the number of simple pairs in S_n, i.e., the number of subsets $\{w, w_{\mathrm{o}}w\}$ with $w \in S_n$ and both w and $w_{\mathrm{o}}w$ simple (note that by Proposition 3.14, w is simple if and only if $w_{\mathrm{o}}w$ is simple). Let $S_A(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} s_n z^n = z^2 + z^4 + 3z^5 + \cdots$ be the corresponding generating function. By [AAK, page 5] we have the following description of $S(z)$. Let $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} n! z^n$ and $G(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} g_n z^n$ its functional inverse, i.e., the function defined by the relation $G(F(z)) = z$. Then $s_1 = 0$, $s_2 = 1$, and $s_n = -g_n/2 - (-1)^n$ for $n \geq 3$.

Number of decompositions into irreducibles. Let a_n be the number of decompositions $\Delta^+_n = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$, where each $\sigma_k \in S_n$ is irreducible, and where we ignore the order in the decomposition. Set $A(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n z^n$ be the generating series. Theorem 1.9 leads to the relation $A(z) = S_A(A(z)) + z$, which recursively determines the coefficients a_n. Here are the low order terms of $A(z)$:

$$A(z) = z + z^2 + 2z^3 + 6z^4 + 23z^5 + 114z^6 + 717z^7 + 5510z^8 + 49570z^9 + 504706z^{10} + \cdots$$

Decompositions of Maximal length. If $\sigma \neq e$ then the inversion set $\Phi(\sigma)$ must contain at least one simple root. Since there are only $n-1$ simple roots, any decomposition $\Delta^+_n = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$, with no $\sigma_a = e$ must satisfy $r \leq n-1$. Let $\mathrm{Cat_A}(n-1)$ denote the number of decompositions of Δ^+_n into exactly $n-1$ non-empty inversion sets. (Thus each inversion set appearing in the decomposition must contain exactly one simple root).

Lemma 6.1. $Cat_A(n) = \frac{1}{n+1}\binom{2n}{n}$*, the* n^{th} *Catalan number.*

Proof. We consider decompositions of the form $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_r)$ and compute $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-1)$. Without loss of generality, the longest root $e_1 - e_n \in \Phi(\sigma_1)$. Suppose that $e_k - e_{k+1}$ is the simple root in $\Phi(\sigma_1)$. Then $\sigma_1(k+1) < \sigma_1(k+2) < \cdots < \sigma_1(n) < \sigma_1(1) < \sigma_1(2) \cdots < \sigma_1(k)$ and therefore $\sigma_1 = (n-k+1, n-k+2, \ldots, n, 1, 2 \ldots, n-k) = (1,2)[\mathrm{Id}_k, \mathrm{Id}_{n-k}]$. Let $I_1 := \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ and $I_2 := \{k_1, k+2, \ldots, n\}$. Then $\Phi(\sigma_1) = \{(e_i - e_j \in \Delta_n^+ \mid i \in I_1, j \in I_2\} = \{e_i - e_j \in \Delta_n^+ \mid i \leq k, j \geq k+1\}$. Therefore $\Delta_{I_1}^+ \sqcup \Delta_{I_2}^+ = \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_3) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_{n-1})$. Without loss of generality, $\Delta_{I_1}^+ = \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_3) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_{k-1})$ and $\Delta_{I_2}^+ = \Phi(\sigma_{k+1}) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_{k+2}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_{n-1})$. This yields the recursion relation $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-1) = \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(t-1)\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-t-1) = \sum_{t=0}^{n-2} \mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(t)\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-t-2)$. Thus $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(t-1)\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-t)$. Since $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(1) = 1$ and $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(2) = 2$ we see that $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n)$ satisfies the usual recursion relation for the Catalan numbers. □

This incarnation of the Catalan numbers does not currently seem to appear on Richard Stanley's list [S] of 198 combinatorial interpretations of the Catalan numbers.

Type B/C results. Theorems 4.6 and 5.4 lead to similar recursions in types B/C. Let $S_B(z)$ be the generating series for the number of simple pairs in type B_n/C_n. Equivalently the coefficient of z^n in $S_B(z)$ is the number of pairs of simple elements in S_{2n+1} each of which are symmetric. The isomorphism $\mathcal{W}(B_n) \cong \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ implies that this is also the number of pairs of simple symmetric elements in S_{2n+1}. One deduces the functional equation

$$S_B(F(z)) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + F(2z)} - \frac{2F(z)}{1 + F(z)},$$

(where $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} n! z^n$ as above) which determines $S_B(z)$. Here are some low order terms:

$$S_B(z) = 2z^2 + 10z^3 + 90z^4 + 966z^5 + 12338z^6 + 181470z^7 + 3018082z^8 + 55995486z^9 + \cdots$$

Decompositions into Irreducibles. Let b_n be the number of decompositions of the positive roots in types B_n/C_n into disjoint unions of inversion sets, and set $B(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} b_n z^n$ to be the generating function. Theorem 4.6 leads to the relation

$$B(z) = \frac{S_B(A(z))}{1 - S_B(A(z))},$$

which completely determines $B(z)$. Here are the low order terms of $B(z)$:

$$B(z) = z + 3z^2 + 14z^3 + 100z^4 + 973z^5 + 11804z^6 + 168809z^7 + 2757930z^8 + 50522912z^9 + \cdots$$

$\mathbf{B}_n/\mathbf{C}_n$ Catalan numbers. Let $\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{B}}(n)$ be the number of decompositions of the positive roots of B_n/C_n into disjoint unions of inversion sets, where each inversion set contains a single simple root. The isomorphism $\mathcal{W}(B_n) \cong \mathcal{W}(C_n)$ implies that the number of such decompositions is the same for types B_n and C_n. As in type A, these are the decompositions of maximal length (subject to the restriction that each inversion set is non-empty) and thus are irreducible decompositions.

Proposition 6.2. *The numbers $Cat_B(n)$ satisfy the recursion $Cat_B(n) = Cat_B(n-1) + 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-2} Cat_A(n-k-1)Cat_B(k)$, and thus*

$$\sum_{n\geq 1} Cat_B(n)z^n = \frac{1}{(1-4z)^{\frac{1}{2}}+z}.$$

Proof. We consider the B_n case. Suppose then that $\Delta^+_{B_n} = \Phi(\alpha_1)\sqcup\Phi(\alpha_2)\sqcup\cdots\sqcup\Phi(\alpha_n)$ where each $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}(B_n)$ and each $\Phi(\alpha_i)$ contains a single simple root of $\Delta^+_{B_n}$. Without loss of generality $\Phi(\tilde{\alpha}_1)$ contains $e_1 - e_{2n+1}$. By Theorem 4.6, we have $\tilde{\alpha}_1 = \tilde{\sigma}_1[\beta_{11}, \beta_{12}, \ldots, \beta_{1(2s+1)}]$ where $\sigma_1 \in \mathcal{W}(B_s)$ and $\beta_t = w_o\beta_{2s+2-t}w_o$ for all $t = 1, 2, \ldots, s$ and either $\sigma_1 = w_o[3]$ or σ_1 is simple and $\Phi(\sigma_1)$ contains a single simple root. Thus $\tilde{\sigma}_1$ is simple, symmetric and $\Phi(\tilde{\sigma}_1)$ contains a pair of A_{2n} simple roots of the form $e_i - e_{i+1}, e_{i'-1} - e_{i'}$. It is not hard to see that this forces $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = w_o[3]$, $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = (25314)$ or $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = (41352)$. The last possibility is excluded by the fact that $\Phi(\tilde{\alpha}_1)$ contains the highest root.

First suppose that $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = w_o[3]$ and let $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2n+1\} = I_1\sqcup I_2\sqcup I_3$ be the corresponding decomposition into intervals with $|I_1| = |I_3| = n-k$ and $|I_2| = 2k+1$ where $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then $\tilde{\alpha_j} = \mathrm{Id}_3[\beta_{j1}, \beta_{j2}, \beta_{j3}]$ for $j = 2, 3, \ldots, n$. Furthermore, without loss of generality, $\Delta^+_{I_1} = \Phi(\beta_{21}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{31}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{(n-k)1})$ is a maximal length decomposition of a root system of type A_{n-k-1}. There are $\mathrm{Cat_A}(n-k-1)$ such decompositions. (We also have $\Delta^+_{I_3} = \Phi(w_o\beta_{23}w_o) \sqcup \Phi(w_o\beta_{33}w_o) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Phi(w_o\beta_{(n-k)3}w_o)$.) Finally $\Delta^+_{I_2} = \Phi(\beta_{(n-k+1)2}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{(n-k+2)2})\sqcup\cdots\sqcup\Phi(\beta_{n2})$ is a maximal symmetric decomposition. There are $\mathrm{Cat_B}(k)$ such decompositions. Thus there are $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\mathrm{Cat_A}(n-k-1)\mathrm{Cat_B}(k)$ maximal decompositions of $\Delta^+_{B_n}$ with $\tilde{\alpha}_1 = w_o[3]$.

Next suppose that $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = (25314)$ and let $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2n+1\} = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_5$ be the corresponding decomposition. Then, as above, $\tilde{\alpha}_2 \sqcup \tilde{\alpha}_3 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \tilde{\alpha}_n$ comprises maximal A type decompositions of $\Delta^+_{I_1}$ and $\Delta^+_{I_2}$ and a maximal symmetric decomposition of $\Delta^+_{I_3}$. Thus there are

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z_1=1}^{n-1}\sum_{z_2=1}^{n-z_1}\mathrm{Cat_A}(z_1)\mathrm{Cat_A}(z_2)\mathrm{Cat_B}(n-z_1-z_2) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\sum_{z_1+z_2=n-k}\mathrm{Cat_B}(k)\mathrm{Cat_A}(z_1)\mathrm{Cat_A}(z_2)\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\mathrm{Cat_B}(k)\mathrm{Cat_A}(n-k-1)\end{aligned}$$

maximal decompositions of $\Delta^+_{B_n}$ with $\tilde{\alpha}_1 = (25314)$.

Adding the contributions of the two cases gives

$$\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{B}}(n) = \mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{B}}(n-1) + 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{A}}(n-k-1)\mathrm{Cat}_{\mathrm{B}}(k)$$

as claimed. This easily implies the stated form of the generating function. □

Remark. We have chosen to call these numbers the "type B/C Catalan numbers", since they come from an enumerative problem about Coxeter groups which yields the usual Catalan numbers in the type A case. There is at least one other use of the term "Catalan numbers for other types" in the literature, again stemming from an enumerative problem (generalizing non-crossing partitions) valid for all Coxeter groups. In this second problem, the type B_n/C_n numbers are $\binom{2n}{n}$ – different from the numbers given by the recursion and generating function above.

Number of decompositions into triples. The most important case – in any type – of the problems motivating these questions about decompositions is the case of decompositions into a disjoint union of three inversion sets. As described in §7 this corresponds to the the case of the eigenvalues of three Hermitian matrices summing to zero (respectively the cup product of two cohomology groups into a third, after a similar symmetrization). The corresponding enumerative/classification problem is to write down all triples σ_1, σ_2, $\sigma_3 \in S_n$ (again disregarding order) with $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(\sigma_1) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_2) \sqcup \Phi(\sigma_3)$. We make the further restriction that no $\sigma_j = e$ (all such triples are of the form $(w, w_{\mathrm{o}}w, e)$ and hence elementary to understand). Theorems 1.9, 4.6, and 5.4 provide a recursive way to generate and enumerate all such triples. Briefly, the method is a parallel recursion keeping track of not only the triples of the kind above, but also the subset of those triples where $\sigma_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}[m]$ for some m. At each step, the new triples of each kind depend on the triples of both kinds for smaller n. (We omit the exact description of the recursion since, although elementary, it is slightly messy.) Here is a small table of the number of such triples, and both the A_n and B_n/C_n cases.

n	A_n triples	B_n/C_n triples
1		1
2	1	4
3	3	33
4	17	351
5	129	4210
6	1116	55495
7	10474	800476
8	104604	12654164
9	1101012	219870187
10	12153179	4206375350

11	140397525	88539459103
12	1697555983	2043502238365
13	21516940295	51440876843396
14	286680892462	1403608329020473
15	4028129552836	41257592671098146
16	59885247963954	1299045890821350162
17	944511887685826	43596718839825553381
18	15828354015222453	1552871403021630700936
19	281880601827533671	58488502832975791077421
20	5327985147037232973	2322044948865982864468235

7. Motivation and an application

In this section we explain our initial motivation for this work and give an application of Theorem 1.9. For clarity of exposition we discuss only the case of type A but everything carries over to the cases of types B and C. The two motivating problems both have versions involving an arbitrary number of factors (which lead to Problem 1.2) but for simplicity we only describe the case of two factors which leads to considering decompositions into three inversion sets.

Regular faces of the Littlewood-Richardson cone. To describe how our work relates to the Littlewood-Richardson cone we first convert the problem of eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices to its symmetric version, i.e., instead of Hermitian matrices A, B, C satisfying $C = A + B$ we will consider Hermitian matrices A, B, C satisfying $A + B + C = 0$. It is clear that the cone $\mathcal{C}''$, analogous to the cone $\mathcal{C}'$ described in §1 is contained in the hyperplane V defined by

$$\lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_n + \mu_1 + \ldots + \mu_n + \nu_1 + \ldots + \nu_n = 0$$

and contains the two-dimensional subspace $W \subset V$ of $(\mathbb{R}^n)^3$ spanned by $(1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, -1, \ldots, -1)$ and $(0, \ldots, 0, 1, \ldots, 1, -1, \ldots, -1)$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}$ image of $\mathcal{C}''$ under the projection $V \to V/W$. We will use again (λ, μ, ν) to denote the projection of a point in V to V/W. The natural coordinates in V/W are $\lambda = (a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1})$, $\mu = (b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1})$, and $\nu = (c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1})$, where $a_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$, $b_i = \mu_i - \mu_{i+1}$, and $c_i = \nu_i - \nu_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Clearly $V/W \cong (\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3$ and S_n acts naturally on each of the components of $(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3$: we fix the natural basis $\{e_i - e_{i+1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and the action of S_n is by permuting the indices of this basis. The cone $\mathcal{C}$ is a pointed polyhedral cone of full dimension. Each of the coordinate hyperplanes $a_i = 0$, $b_i = 0$, and $c_i = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ is a facet of $\mathcal{C}$. Let $(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3_+$ denote the dominant cone defined by $a_i \geq 0, b_i \geq 0, c_i \geq 0$. A face of $\mathcal{C}$ is regular if it intersects the interior of $(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3_+$. N. Ressayre proved that the regular faces of $\mathcal{C}$ have codimension at most $n-1$. Furthermore, the faces of codimension $n-1$ are exactly the intersection of $(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3_+$ with the subspaces T_{w_1,w_2,w_3} defined by

$$w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu = 0$$

for (w_1, w_2, w_3) with the property that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3)$, see Theorem C in [R]. Let (w_1, w_2, w_3) be such a triple and denote by $\mathcal{C}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}$ the corresponding face of $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_{w_1,w_2,w_3} = T_{w_1,w_2,w_3} \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n-1})^3_+ = T_{w_1,w_2,w_3} \cap \mathcal{C}$.

Note that $\mathcal{C}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}$ is described by its defining hyperplanes - $n-1$ from the equation $w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu = 0$ and $3(n-1)$ from $a_i = 0$, $b_i = 0$, and $c_i = 0$. It is difficult to conclude from this description what its defining rays are. We will now show that Theorem 1.9 allows us to conclude that $\mathcal{C}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}$ is a simplicial cone and provides an algorithm for writing down its defining rays. (The fact that $\mathcal{C}_{w_1,w_2,w_3}$ is a simplicial cone also follows from some results in [DR].) In this section it will be convenient to identify the elements of Δ_n^+ with the vectors $e_i - e_j$. Consider the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ defined by $(\lambda, e_i - e_j) := \lambda_i - \lambda_j$. It is immediate that, for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$,

$$(\lambda, e_i - e_j) = a_i + \ldots + a_{j-1}.$$

This product is S_n-invariant; in particular we have $(w^{-1}\lambda, e_i - e_j) = (\lambda, w(e_i - e_j))$ for any $w \in S_n$ and $e_i - e_j \in \Delta_n^+$. To obtain defining a set of defining equations for T_{w_1,w_2,w_3} it is sufficient to chose a basis $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ consisting of elements of Δ_n^+ and write

$$(w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu, \alpha_i) = 0$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Consider the form of the equation $(w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu, \alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \in \Delta_n^+$. Exactly one of $w_1(\alpha), w_2(\alpha), w_3(\alpha)$ is negative, say $w_1(\alpha) = -(e_i - e_j)$, $w_2(\alpha) = e_k - e_l$, and $w_3(\alpha) = e_p - e_q$. Then $(w_1^{-1}\lambda + w_2^{-1}\mu + w_3^{-1}\nu, \alpha) = 0$ becomes

$$a_i + \ldots + a_{j-1} = b_k + \ldots + b_{l-1} + c_p + \ldots + c_{q-1}.$$

This equation is especially simple when $-w_1(\alpha)$ is simple, i.e. when $j = i+1$. Then it becomes

$$a_i = b_k + \ldots + b_{l-1} + c_p + \ldots + c_{q-1}.$$

Borrowing from elementary linear algebra, we call a_i an *α-pivot variable* and $b_k, \ldots, b_{l-1}$, $c_p, \ldots, c_{q-1}$ *α-free variables.*

Proposition 7.1. *Assume that $\Delta_n^+ = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3)$. The set*

$$S_{w_1,w_2,w_3} = \{\alpha \in \Delta_n^+ \mid -w_1(\alpha) \text{ is simple or } -w_2(\alpha) \text{ is simple or } -w_3(\alpha) \text{ is simple}\}$$

is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Furthermore, this set can be labeled $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$ so that, for $i < j$, the α_i-pivot variable is not an α_j-free variable.

Proof. Let $w_i = \sigma_i[\beta_{i1}, \beta_{i2}, \ldots, \beta_{im}]$ and let $I = I_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup I_m$ be the corresponding decomposition into intervals of $I = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Assume $\alpha = e_i - e_j \in S_{w_1,w_2,w_3}$. Define the *level of* α inductively as follows: if i and j belong to different parts of I, then the level of α is one; otherwise, $i, j \in I_k$ and the level of α is one plus the level of α for the decomposition $\Delta^+_{z_k} = \Phi(\beta_{1k}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{2k}) \sqcup \Phi(\beta_{3k})$. Consider the projection $I \to \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Under this projection the level one elements of S_{w_1,w_2,w_3} are sent to the elements of $S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3}$ which form a basis since either $\sigma_1 = w_{\mathrm{o}}$ or $\sigma_2 = w_{\mathrm{o}}\sigma_1$. The elements of level greater than one are sent to zero. On the other hand, by a simple inductive argument, the elements of level greater than one form bases in the subspace generated by $\{e_i - e_j \mid i, j$ in the same $I_k\}$. Combining the above we conclude that S_{w_1,w_2,w_3} is a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

To prove the second assertion, we order S_{w_1,w_2,w_3} linearly so that elements of lower level come before elements of higher level. Notice first that if α_1 is of level one and α_2 is of level greater than one, than no α_1-pivot variable is α_2-free. Now assume that both α_1 and α_2 are of level one. Passing to the projection as above, we conclude again that no α_1-pivot variable is α_2-free. $\square$

We call the α_i-pivot variables simply *pivot variables* of C_{w_1,w_2,w_3} and the rest of a_i, b_i, c_i we call *free variables.*

Corollary 7.2. *C_{w_1,w_2,w_3} is a simplicial cone.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 7.1 that there are exactly $n-1$ pivot variables. Furthermore, by ordering them as above we can start from the bottom and replace any pivot variable appearing in the expression of another pivot variable by its expression. When we reach the top equation, every pivot variable will have become expressed with non-negative coefficients in terms of the free variables only. $\square$

Example 7.3. We continue with Example 1.10. Recall that $w_1 = (5,3,4,8,1,2,6,7)$, $w_2 = (4,5,6,1,7,8,3,2)$, $w_3 = (1,3,2,4,6,5,7,8)$ and $\Delta^+_8 = \Phi(w_1) \sqcup \Phi(w_2) \sqcup \Phi(w_3)$. The set S_{w_1,w_2,w_3} together with the corresponding equations by level is:

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Level 1:} & e_2 - e_6 : & a_2 = b_5 + b_6 + b_7 + & c_3 + c_4 \\
 & e_4 - e_8 : & a_7 = b_1 + & c_4 + c_5 + c_6 + c_7 \\
 & e_1 - e_7 : & b_3 = a_5 + & c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 + c_5 + c_6 \\
\text{Level 2:} & e_1 - e_3 : & a_4 = b_4 + b_5 + & c_1 \\
 & e_5 - e_6 : & c_5 = a_1 + & b_7 \\
 & e_7 - e_8 : & b_2 = a_6 + & c_7 \\
\text{Level 3:} & e_2 - e_3 : & c_2 = a_3 + & b_5.
\end{array}$$

The pivot variables c_2 and c_5 appear in the expressions for a_7 and b_3 and need to be replaced. After the appropriate substitutions we obtain that the generating rays $r_1, \dots, r_{14}$ of C_{w_1,w_2,w_3} corresponding to the free variables $a_1, a_3, a_5, a_6, b_1, b_4, b_5, b_6, b_7, c_1, c_3, c_4, c_6, c_7$

respectively are:

	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6	a_7	b_1	b_2	b_3	b_4	b_5	b_6	b_7	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6	c_7
r_1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
r_2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
r_3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
r_8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
r_{10}	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
r_{11}	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
r_{12}	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
r_{13}	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
r_{14}	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.

Cup products of line bundles on homogeneous varieties. Let $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$, let $B \subset G$ be a Borel subgroup, and let $X = G/B$. The Picard group of X is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and hence the line bundles on X are parametrized by $\mathbb{Z}^n$. We denote by $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ the line bundle on X which corresponds to the B-character $-\lambda$. We call $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ *dominant* if $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n$ and *strictly dominant* if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \ldots > \lambda_n$. Let $\rho = (n-1, n-2, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We call $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ *regular* if there exists $w \in S_n$ such that $w \cdot \lambda := w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ is dominant. Clearly, such a w is unique and we denote it by w_λ. The celebrated Borel-Weil-Bott theorem calculates the cohomology groups $H^q(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. More precisely, it states that $H^q(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ is zero unless λ is regular and q equals the length of w_λ. In the latter case, $H^q(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \cong V(w_\lambda \cdot \lambda)^*$, where $V(\mu)$ denotes the irreducible G-module with highest weight μ. In [DR] two of us studied the following question: For what pairs $\lambda, \mu, \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is the cup product map

$$H^{q_1}(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \otimes H^{q_2}(X, \mathcal{L}_\mu) \xrightarrow{\cup} H^{q_1+q_2}(X, \mathcal{L}_{\lambda+\mu})$$

nonzero provided that the all cohomology groups above are nonzero? Theorem I in [DR] states that $\Phi(w_{\lambda+\mu}) = \Phi(w_\lambda) \sqcup \Phi(w_\mu)$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for nonvanishing of the cup product map above.

8. Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by NSERC. In particular, most of it was done with the support of NSERC's Undergraduate Summer Research Awards program.

References

[AA] M.H. Albert and M.D. Atkinson, *Simple permutations and pattern restricted permutations*, Discrete Math. **300** (2005) 115.

[AAK] M.H. Albert, M.D. Atkinson and M. Klazar, *The enumeration of simple permutations*, J. Integer Seq., **6** (2003) Article 03.4.4, 18 pp. (electronic).

[B] R. Brignall, *A survey of simple permutations. Permutation patterns*, 41–65, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., **376**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[DR] I. Dimitrov and M. Roth, *Cup product of line bundles on homogeneous varieties and generalized PRV components of multiplicity one*, arXiv:0909.2280v1.

[F] W. Fulton, *Eigenvalues, invariant factors, highest weights, and Schubert calculus*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **37** (2000), 209249.

[K] B. Kostant, *Lie algebra cohomology and the generalized Borel-Weil theorem*, Ann. Math. **74** (1961) 329–387.

[R] N. Ressayre, *Geometric invariant theory and generalized eigenvalue problem II*, Annales de l Institut Fourier, to appear.

[S] R. Stanley, *Catalan Addendum.* http://www-math.mit.edu/~rstan/ec/

[ST] J. H. Schmerl and W. T. Trotter, *Critically indecomposable partially ordered sets, graphs, tournaments and other binary relational structures*, Discrete Math., **113**(1-3) (1993) 191–205.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 3N6
E-mail address: `riandewji@gmail.com`

Department of Mathematics and Statistics Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 3N6
E-mail address: `dimitrov@mast.queensu.ca`

760 Lawrence Ave. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M6A 1B7
E-mail address: `adam.r.mccabe@gmail.com`

Department of Mathematics and Statistics Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 3N6
E-mail address: `mikeroth@mast.queensu.ca`

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7K 5L0
E-mail address: `wehlau@rmc.ca`

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, 60637 USA
E-mail address: `wilsonj@math.uchicago.edu`